

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-5 are now in the application. Claims 1-5 are subject to examination.

Claim 5 has been added.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-4 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,677,616 to Franklin under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Franklin discloses a packet switching system 100, in which the interconnection between two stations 101 and 111 is achieved by a packet switching system 100 (see column 3, lines 38 to 41).

One of the stations in Fig. 1 is a calling station, while the other is the called station (see column 4, lines 4 to 12). Each station has several logical channels available to it, of which one is a signaling channel that is reserved for communication with the PSC 130 (see column 3, lines 55 to 69). In order to establish a virtual circuit call between stations, the calling station sends a signaling packet over the data bus 140 to the PSC 130 using the signaling channel (see column 3, lines 61 to 66). Besides containing the calling stations signaling logical channel number, the packet further includes the logical channel number to be used by the calling station for the call (see column 4,

lines 4 to 12). The PSC 130 receives the packet and uses a cross index to find the address of the port which serves the called station and an idle logical channel associated with the called station (see column 4, lines 40 to 45). The address and the logical channel information is sent to the calling port and is programmed into a translation RAM with the calling station logical channel number specified in the signaling package being used as the RAM's address. Each time the calling station sends a packet containing the logical channel used for communicating with the called station, the calling station's logical channel number is used to read out the called port address and the called station logical channel number. This information is inserted by the calling port as header address information into the packet and is applied to the data bus 140. The receiving port serving the called station receives the packet by recognizing its port address in the packet (see column 4, lines 45 to 63).

Claim 1 defines a data bus configuration, comprising:

at least one control station;

at least one reception station;

a data bus operated in a multiplex mode and connected to said control station and to said reception station; and

a control bus connected to said control station and to said reception station,
and through said control bus said control station allocating a logical channel to
said reception station.

In claim 1, the communication occurs between two units –namely, between the
control station and the reception station. In contrast to the invention as defined
by claim 1, Franklin describes communication between three units, for
example, between station 101 and station 111, where the interconnection over
the data bus 140 between the stations is achieved by a third unit, namely, the
packet switching control (PSC) 130 (see column 3, lines 38 to 41).

In Franklin the communication between stations 101, 111 and the PSC 130 is
basically limited to setting up an interconnection between the two stations.
Further, please note that the called station mentioned in column 4, line 45,
which the Examiner has identified as the “reception station” does not
correspond to the reception station defined in claim 1, but rather refers to
another station (“called station”) to which a station (“calling station”) is trying to
interconnect using the PSC.

In contrast to claim 1, Franklin does not teach the control station allocating a
logical channel to the reception station through the control bus. The logical
channel in Franklin is determined by the calling station and not by the control
station PSC 130. The calling station sends a signaling packet containing data
which includes the logical channel to be used by the calling station for the call

(see column 4, lines 4-12). Further, the allocation in Franklin occurs by sending data over the data bus 140 instead of over the control bus 141. Fig. 1 of Franklin shows that the control bus 141 only sends data into the ports 102 but never out. See also, for example, column 4, lines 20-21, which states that the packet is placed on the data bus 140.

The invention as defined by claim 1 is not anticipated.

Claim 2 defines a method for operating a data bus configuration having at least one control station, at least one reception station, a data bus operated in a multiplex mode and connected to the control station and to the reception station, and a control bus connected to the control station and to the reception station, which comprises the steps of:

using the control station to transfer an address onto the data bus for soliciting the reception station;

allocating a logical channel to the reception station through the control bus; and

interchanging data between the control station and the reception station for as long as the logical channel remains allocated to the reception station and is called.

Franklin does not teach using a control station to transfer an address onto the

data bus for soliciting the reception station as is specified by claim 2. In contrast, Franklin teaches that the calling station sends a packet to the packet switch control (PSC) 130. This has already been described above with regard to claim 1. The PSC 130 merely receives the packet.

Franklin also does not teach allocating a logical channel to the reception station through the control bus as is specified by claim 2. Perhaps the Examiner might argue that column 4, lines 32 to 39 of Franklin teach that the PSC 130 can send signal packets to each station where the address field contains the station's port address and the station's signaling channel number. However, in this case, Franklin fails to teach that the logical channel is allocated to the reception station. Franklin teaches that the station's signaling channel number, which is the logical channel number of the PSC 130 (see column 4, lines 1 to 3), is already part of the packet and is in no way allocated to the reception station.

Additionally, in claim 2 the logical channel is allocated through the control bus, whereas in contrast, Franklin teaches that the packet is transmitted on the data bus 140 (see column 4, line 39). Again, if the Examiner were to argue that the PSC130 allocates an idle logical channel (see column 4, lines 40 to 45), it must be remembered that the called station mentioned in this passage does not correspond to the reception station of claim 2, but rather refers to a third unit.

Franklin also does not teach interchanging data between the control station and

the reception station for as long as the logical channel remains allocated to the reception station and is called, as is specified by claim 2. Franklin does not teach interchanging the data between a station 101 and the packet switch control 130 as long as there is a logical channel allocated to the station and is called. In contrast to the feature of claim 2, which has been mentioned above, Franklin teaches that the PSC 130 is used for interconnecting two stations 101 and 111. The logical channel information is sent to the calling port and is programmed into a translation RAM so that each time the calling station sends a packet that contains the logical channel used for communicating with the called station, the called port address is read out from RAM (See column 4, lines 45-57). There is no need to interchange data between the station 101 and the PSC 130.

The invention as defined by claim 2 is not anticipated.

Support for added claim 5 can be found by referring to claims 1 and 2 as originally presented.

Claim 5 is not anticipated for the reasons given above with regard to claim 1. Further, claim 5 includes the limitation, said control station and said reception station interchanging data for as long as said logical channel remains allocated to said reception station and is called.

In contrast to claim 5, however, Franklin teaches that after programming the

translation RAM, the PSC 130 is no longer involved in communicating with the stations 101, 111, so that no data is interchanged as long as the logical channel remains allocated.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 2, or 5. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 2.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/662,794
Amdt. Dated February 14, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

February 14, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101